

TECHNICAL MEETING SUMMARY

22 - 23 May 2006

NAVAL AIR STATION BRUNSWICK

Location: Maine Dept. of Environmental Protection
Portland, Maine

1. MEETING ATTENDEES

Lisa Joy, IR Program Coordinator	NAS Brunswick, Environmental Dept.
Lonnie Monaco, Remedial Project Manager	U.S. Navy, NAVFAC MidAtlantic
Dawn Kincaid, BRAC Environmental Coordinator	U.S. Navy, BRAC PMO Northeast
Christine Williams, Remedial Project Manager	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 1
Dave Peterson, Attorney	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 1
Claudia Sait, Remedial Project Manager	Maine Department of Environmental Protection
Chris Evans, Project Geologist	Maine Department of Environmental Protection
Carolyn Lepage, TAG Consultant	Lepage Environmental Services
Al Easterday, Project Geologist	ECC
Darren Gainer, Project Manager	ECC
Carol Warren	Brunswick LRA Representative

MEETING LOCATION: The Technical Meeting was held at the Maine Department of Environmental Protection Agency office in Portland, Maine on 22 May and 23 May 2006 and began at 1230 hours. This is the first day of a two-day Technical Meeting for the Naval Air Station (NAS) Brunswick Installation Restoration Program (IRP) sites.

2. INTRODUCTIONS AND MEETING LOGISTICS

Lonnie Monaco opened the Technical Meeting. The Technical Meeting agenda is provided in Attachment A. The sign-in sheets for attendees at each of the Technical Meetings are provided in Attachment B.

Meeting began with a discussion of what to include on the August 2006 Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting agenda. Carol Warren asked for a schedule that would provide a look ahead into the future for the RAB members. Claudia stated that the Site 2 Work Plan, Site 9 Remedial Action, and Site 9 Impoundment Pond Sampling should be agenda items for the August 2006 RAB Meeting.

Claudia Sait requested that the Navy immediately cease watering the ball fields adjacent to the treatment plant building with the treatment plant effluent, since there is 1,4-dioxane in the treated effluent. During a recent site visit by MEDEP and EPA, the Activity mentioned that the ball fields near the treatment plant were being irrigated with treated effluent from the GWETS. There was a discussion of the regulatory driver for MEDEP and EPA to ask the Navy to cease this activity at once, which are the ARARs in the Eastern Plume Record of Decision (ROD). Christine Williams referenced the Mine Department of Health guidelines are ARARs too. Claudia requested that the Navy conduct the following action regarding this matter:

- 1.) Stop watering the ball fields with GWETS effluent
- 2.) Determine what the risk is (dermal contact)
- 3.) Determine which fields were irrigated with GWETS effluent
- 4.) Execute a sampling program

Claudia suggested the Navy might combine this work with the proposed background sampling program.

Review Agenda for RAB Meeting

The meeting attendees discussed the RAB Meeting agenda. As a result of the discussion, the draft agenda for the RAB meeting is as follows:

- Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP)-expand to present areas of concern (AOC) for MMRP
- Newsletter
- Extraction Well Update
- IRP Schedule
- Site 2 Work Plan
- Site 9 Removal Action
- Mere Brook Work Plan
- 1,4-Dioxane

Lonnie Monaco stated there were plenty of agenda items for August 2006 RAB Meeting and he would like to get the agenda distributed to the Commanding Officer and Tom Fusco (RAB Co-Chairs) in June 2006 to give them plenty of time to review the agenda.

Note - Lisa Joy, NASB IRP Manager, joins the meeting at 1305 hours.

Lonnie summarized what the group had covered during the beginning of the meeting for Lisa. Lonnie asked Lisa to gather what information she could about the irrigation of the playing fields with the treated effluent from the GWETS and immediately suspend use of GWETS effluent to irrigate playing fields. Lisa indicated that she has not observed any use of the soccer field by children, just adults. Lisa also indicated that she will request suspension of any irrigation using GWETS effluent, if the field is currently being irrigated by the effluent. The group then discussed various risk scenarios, both current (adults) and future (adults & children) and how it might relate to redevelopment decisions for this area of the base.

3. ARAR REVIEW SCHEDULE

Lonnie Monaco is hoping to process a contract modification to ECC's contract for ARAR review, along with several other tasks. He will brief the meeting attendees on the progress of this contract action at a later date.

Darren Gainer explained the ARAR review will be subcontracted to MACTEC, Inc. using technical staff located in their Portland, Maine office. ECC has teamed with MACTEC on other contracts and project work and they have an experienced regulatory specialist that would perform a thorough review of the ARAR's. The ARAR review process will be split into three

phases, the first being an initial review of the revised ARAR tables provided by EPA that included in the Second Five-Year Review report. Based on the results of the initial review, additional reviews would be tasked to examine the ARAR's with consideration of the existing language in the RODs and identify any potential conflicting requirements. Christine Williams requested a conference call to discuss identified issues from the initial phase of review. Lonnie Monaco asked if Ralph (Lombardo, Navy attorney) and Dave (Peterson) should have the conference call, since this is more of a legal issue. Dave stated only for larger issues that the Navy might identify, not just for technical points. Dave further stated that the main point is to harmonize ARAR's between NPL sites at the Base. If issues are identified there could be a simple review and explanation of the possible inconsistencies with the ROD's which could be addressed in a 1-page Explanation of Significant Difference (ESD).

Note - Claudia stated that Jeff Brandon of MACTEC said the Sites 1 and 3 Landfill as-builts are in the NAS Brunswick Administrative Record at the Brunswick Memorial Library. The as-builts are in the OHM Close Out Report for the landfill.

4. SITE 9

Removal Action update provided by Lisa Joy. The concrete building slab for building 217 is the only remaining one that needs to be removed. Visual inspection indicated mechanical room floors were intact. C. Williams asked how far (depth) was ash layer encountered below the concrete mechanical room floor. Lisa indicated the contractor has not removed ash just concrete slab. The demolition contractor was not as aggressive with removing the buildings at the southern end of Bldg 220 and the southern end of Bldg. 218 was clean. The contractor set up the Site boundary but needs to expand the boundary area in the northern portion of the Site.

C. Sait asked where drums (small crushed containers) were found on-site. Lisa indicated they were near the southern end of Bldg 219. A steam line between Bldgs. 219 and 220 was identified and will need to come out and is suspected to contain asbestos. The EMAC contractor has collected waste confirmatory samples and the results are due in within a week. The ash layer at the southern end of the Site may extend beneath the roadway (Avenue C) and further investigation may be required to determine actual extent of ash layer. EPA and MEDEP recommend getting all the ash waste while the Site is opened up and the contractor is on-site. The Navy indicated that this was the fourth change in conditions but the Navy emphasized commitment to doing a complete removal action. L. Joy indicated the contractor anticipates excavation of the ash layer starting in June. The contractor will dig from north to south in 12-18 inch lifts.

D. Kincaid raised the issue that groundwater treatment was included in the contract scope of work but limited by quantity and the Navy may need to change management process of groundwater in order to control costs.

Note - Edward Benedikt joins the technical meeting at 1420 hours.

Site 9 Impoundment Pond

Lisa Joy provided the meeting attendees with a status update regarding the assessment of the sheen in the Site 9 impoundment pond.

Claudia Sait requested the Navy to install a containment boom by the impoundment pond dam. Dave and Christine both stated there is an apparent violation of various permits including the Clean Water Act, 313 Permit, Storm Water Permit and that the presence of sheen is cause to report, and not reporting a sheen is a violation of various laws and regulations. Christine Williams requested that the Navy determine the source of the sheen and the DRO detections (identified in groundwater samples collected from certain Site 9 wells). The group discussed conducting a direct push investigation around Building 201 to assist with assessment of the DRO concentrations in groundwater and possibly the sheen in the impoundment pond.

Ed Benedikt asks who is going to conduct the sampling of the impoundment pond. Claudia Sait asks who will be the official Navy point of contact for this issue, the Activity or Mid-Lant? Lonnie Monaco and Dawn Kincaid stated the situation is a compliance issue and they do not have authority to deal with this issue; therefore, the Activity will be the official point of contact for this issue. Lisa Joy identified Greg Apraham, the Director of Environmental, as the point of contact for Claudia and Christine. MEDEP requested that the Navy respond to the regulators requests within one week. Lisa Joy said she would relay this request to Greg.

Note - ESD schedule agenda item was not discussed.

5. INSTITUTIONAL CONTROLS

Christine Williams asked the Navy if the IC agenda discussion will include other IC items at other sites at NAS Brunswick? Lonnie Monaco stated that the IC revisions are part of a pending ECC contract modification. MEDEP asked what is the approach for IC on groundwater use by the Navy? Lisa Joy replied that the revised Base Instruction will include EPA and MEDEP review in any groundwater use issue.

Dawn Kincaid offered an update on how the Navy overall will track land use controls (LUCs). Navy has a program called "LUC Tracker" which is being beta tested now at a couple of Activities. TetraTech NUS (TtNUS) is the Navy's contractor for this effort. The Navy could give a demonstration of LUC tracker at later date. Dave Peterson asked if the goal of this was to replace the Base Instruction. Lisa indicated that the LUC Tracker probably would not replace the Base Instruction, as the instruction outlines the internal base procedures.

6. SITE 17 (BUILDING 95)

Claudia Sait stated the area north of the excavation limits at Bldg 95, the Navy had not indicated the need to not cut trees during the removal action back in the mid 1990s; however, trees were cut for the dog kennel that was recently constructed by the Navy. MEDEP wants to make sure the Site is bounded during the next investigation phase by the Navy.

ECC will take for action to review previous reports for any sampling efforts at the north end of Site and include some borings if no previous borings had been completed in this area of the site.

EPA, Dave and Christine have quickly reviewed the Navy letter and were encouraged to see that Site 12 and Site 17 are going to be included in the NAS Brunswick Installation Restoration Program (IRP).

Note: Following discussion topic relative to Site 12 (not on agenda).

Dawn Kincaid stated that there are some activity issues that Lisa wants to discuss with the meeting attendees.

Lisa Joy stated that the Maine National Guard is in the process of evaluating the area north of the EOD pit (Site 12) for possible acquisition for development by the MENG. The Maine NG Headquarters (HQ) group is conducting the evaluation which will include a mini-environmental evaluation report. The area being evaluated by the Maine NG is approximately 30 acres. During the site walk with Maine National Guard representatives and the Brunswick Activity, the group noted one small area what may have been a small target practice area. The Brunswick Activity is research files and seeking information about this area of the base. Lisa Joy will ask weapons personnel about this area of the base, which may have been used as an informal target practice area. Lisa Joy passed around photographs that she had taken during the site walk of the area of interest. Lisa stated that Summit Environmental is the Maine National Guards contractor for this evaluation of this potential development area at NAS Brunswick.

Lisa Joy has reviewed Base aerial photographs that appear to show that Site 12 remained in the same configuration with pits and berms as it currently is, only the 1985 photograph showed a second EOD pit at Site 12.

7. SITE 7

Lisa Joy discussed the observations of earthen mounds and berms located to the east-northeast of the Site 7 Remedial Investigation area with the meeting attendees. She said that these mounds and berms do not appear to be natural features and wanted to inform the group of this observation. MEDEP asked the Navy what their plan for Site 7 is and other area north of Site 12?

Christine Williams asked Lisa if Site 7 appeared to be a former range area? Lisa Joy stated no, the Site 7 area does not appear to be a former range based on a preliminary review. Lonnie Monaco indicated this area will be investigated under the Brunswick IRP.

Al Easterday briefed the meeting attendees about the groundwater contour figures for Site 7 that were developed from the recently completed quarterly gauging program at the site. ECC is developing a work plan which will present the locations of the proposed two groundwater monitoring wells. ECC expects to release the draft work plan in June 2006. A letter report will be produced that presents the results of the quarterly gauging program that was recently completed at Site 7.

Note - Lisa Joy departs the meeting at 1635 hours.

SITE 2

The meeting attendees decided to discuss the Site 2 Work Plan. The general approach for Site 2 Work Plan was reviewed. Chris Evans asked about calibration curve information from the current LTM contract laboratory North East Laboratory (NEL). MEDEP stated that they will assign a chemist to review data for QC for Site 2 LTM.

Meeting adjourns at 1745 hours.

Wednesday, 23 May 2006

Meeting began at 0930 hours in the MEDEP's office in Portland, Maine.

Lonnie Monaco started meeting by reviewing yesterday day's agenda with attention to the discussion of Site 9 issues relating to the impoundment pond and recent detections of diesel range organics (DRO). Lisa Joy and Greg Apraham spoke yesterday about the impound pond issues and stated that the Activity POC will be Paul Kempf, who will follow the guidelines of the permit and will contact Steve Brezinski at MEDEP Spill Response. DRO has been detected in MW-NASB-075 (now referred to as the "Building 201 Area of Concern"). Navy intends to task ECC with preparing a direct push work plan and executing the proposed work at Site 9. Claudia Sait asked if the Brunswick IRP and compliance effort will be joined, or coordinated, to address the impoundment issue. The Navy indicated the information will be communicated between compliance and the IRP.

Site 9 well replacement wells include the following wells; MW-69, MW-79, MW-80 and MW-81. A new groundwater monitoring well is proposed for placement in southwest corner of IC boundary, the current IC boundary as presented in the site's 1999 ROD. MEDEP cautioned that the new well in vicinity of well MW-76 area will need to be analyzed for different contaminant densities, both light phase (floaters) and dense phase (sinkers) contaminants. Monitoring well MW-76 is part of Site 9 Long Term Monitoring Program.

Bldg 95 discussion – Lonnie indicated that ECC and the Navy discussed the possibility of conducting the investigation of the south and north areas together. ECC also proposed that it may be possible to conduct the proposed field work at Site 12 simultaneously with the planned field work to be conducted at Bldg 95. MEDEP stated that the northern edge of contamination (near the dog kennels) at Bldg 95 may not have been delineated, and suggested including additional borings in the final work plan be advanced in this area of the site. MEDEP suggested that the June 1993 Draft Final Closure Report (ABB) be reviewed prior to any additional work being conducted in this area. All parties also agreed that any additional work to be conducted in the northern portion of the site, as well as additional investigative work across Avenue B to the south, will be addressed as part of the RTC to the draft Bld 95 work plan. Lisa Joy will provide ECC with Base utility drawings to facilitate selection of direct push sampling locations.

Dawn Kincaid stated that the Navy has another issue with Site 9 involving the Removal Action. The southern extent of ash landfill/dump area may extend under Avenue C, which is further than the Navy had previously identified. The Navy will be checking into photographs and maps for evidence the southern extent of the landfill under Avenue C.

8. MERE BROOK INVESTIGATION

The group discussed the layout of investigation points within the area of the confluence of Mere Brook and Merriconeag Stream. The EPA and MEDEP commented on the positioning of the location of the investigation transects and that a total of 3 or 4 total transects might be required. MEDEP agrees with the positioning of one long transect starting around the vicinity of DP-EP-05 (near cemetery) and extending to DP-LOG-02 (south end of transect). EPA recommends a

phased approach beginning with the area of highest concentrations identified during the previous investigations. Navy is in agreement with a phased approach. Dawn Kincaid stated the investigation will require access agreements with private land owners east of the base. The sooner we could provide a conceptual plan, the sooner Navy could secure the access.

9. 1,4-DIOXANE ASSESSMENT

EPA stated that they want a 6 ppb level for 1,4-dioxane at NAS Brunswick. This is a risk-based number that EPA is using at a site in Connecticut. The Maine MEG is currently 32 ppb, which is an ARAR according to the MEDEP. EPA informed the Navy that based on ARAR to restore the aquifer, the treatment system must provide treatment of 1,4 dioxane. MEDEP asked if a background study has been completed that demonstrates there is a high background concentration of 1,4 dioxane. Navy indicated a background study is a forthcoming task to be completed at NASB and that treatment options would be discussed following the completion of further investigation. EPA recommended the Navy utilize the ARAR of 32 ppb (State MEG) for an Action Level at NAS Brunswick.

Note – At this time, the EPA and MEDEP requested the Activity to provide to them the sediment data from Site 9. In addition, Christine wants to know who the Activity sends the sediment data to at EPA so she can obtain a copy of the data.

10. STATUS OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROLS AND BASE INSTRUCTION

This agenda item was discussed the previous day, see item number five for additional details.

11. DRAFT RAB MEETING AGENDA FOR 8 AUGUST 2006

This agenda item was discussed the previous day, see item number two for additional details.

12. REVIEW ACTION ITEMS

The group reviewed the action items developed during the two days of meetings.

The 23 May 2006 Technical Meeting ended at 1200 hours.